



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

whence comes "the higher respect for allegory" (48) which is characteristic of the period. Dante, whose name was so often on their lips, may not be disregarded as a factor in the rise of this new attitude toward the treatment of allegory.

Professor Post closes his study with a chapter on the relation between allegorical art and literature. As in the field of letters, he finds that their sculptures are primarily the reflection of the French School of the Middle Ages, untouched by the dawn of the Renaissance in Italy. He brings to this phase of the work a richness of experience which is an invaluable asset of the student of the medieval art, and throughout the book he evidences a breadth of reading which breeds a confidence in the thoroughness with which he has surveyed the field. The task of tracing the sources of medieval writers is a difficult one from the very fact that manuscripts were not the property of most men of letters. Their images and fancies, when they are not actually translating a work, are a composite of a throng of reminiscences retained from their reading and from their listening which take on a new personality in this process of transformation. At best we can hope only to recreate for the present day some idea of the range of their literary interests and acquaintanceships. This task Prof. Post has performed for the allegorical poets of medieval Spain with admirable learning and skill. His study broadens our vision of the artistic and intellectual activities of that formative period which prepares the way for the Golden Age of Spain.

R. H. KENISTON.

ITHACA, N. Y.

---

The Odes of Pindar, including the Principal Fragments, with an Introduction and an English Translation, by Sir JOHN SANDYS. (Loeb Series.) London: William Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Co. MCMXV.

Ever since I quitted the business of making translations and acquired some insight into the languages from which translations are made, nothing stirs in me so easily the feeling which according to Seneca is the last to grow old, as the question what I think of this or that translation. To this last infirmity, I have pleaded guilty more than once (e. g. A. J. P. XIII 517; XXX 353, 474); and now that the Loeb Series is in full course, life is not worth living. What is a boon to the world is a bane to the individual. What a critical examination would mean to me, what a lavish expenditure of the few remaining

sands of time it would involve, I illustrated not long ago by the discussion of a single phrase in the translation of Philostratos' *Life of Apollonios* (A. J. P. XXXIV 234, 360). But for all that, I cannot lightly put aside my good friend Sir John Sandys' translation of Pindar in the Loeb Series, and in point of fact I have spent untold hours in rereading Pindar, largely moved thereto by the companionship of that eminent classical scholar. To be sure, as the text faces the translation, I find it hard to keep my eyes from Pindar himself, hard to weigh Pindar's gold against money current with the merchant. Greece itself comes back to me. Once more I pass a door in Gýtheion, and hear an old man ask his granddaughter in a sharp tone, How many drachmas are there in a napoleon?—Only my question takes the form, How much paper money is there in Pindar's gold? True, Landor's *Aspasia* thinks that there is too much gold in Pindar, and one seems to hear the chink of coin in some of his catalogues of victors, but for all that his gold pieces are fascinating; and I am once more at Athens in the rooms of the antiquary Rhousopoulos, and watch him as he brooded lovingly over his collection of ancient coins. Many of them were for sale, but with some of them he could not prevail upon himself to part; and in like manner, the lover of Pindar cannot bring himself to exchange Greek staters even for English sovereigns. Symmetry? One ceases to care for symmetry. Even your money-changer displays his gold loose in a dish. Translation has to do not with symmetry but with the detail work by which Pindar is most comprehensible. In his *Sappho and Simonides*, quoted by Sandys, p. 561, Wilamowitz, writing of the *Prosodion* on Delos, is constrained to declare 'Wer an sprachlicher Kunst als solcher Gefallen findet, wird hier ein Juwel, einen seltenen Edelstein in reichster Fassung anerkennen', and there are other rare jewels, other rich settings, and I am not deterred by the cry of 'barbaric gold and pearl'. However, the narrow limits of the space allotted to reviews compel me to reserve what I have to say of Sir John's translation for a later number, in which I hope to begin a series of *Pindarica*. Still, for fear of the untowardness of fate, it is simply due to the work of an accomplished scholar, that I should commend his rendering to the attention of beginners in Pindar, for whom my own edition was intended. I must confess, that before I began the study, I was inclined to think it would be dangerous in any one to compete with Myers. Myers is a poet and the poet is supposed to have the golden key to the palace of poetry. Mistakes in detail are redeemed by sympathy. But as a grammatical soul, I have found myself shocked by Myers, as I have been by other poetical geniuses, who have undertaken to interpret Greek poetry. Not long ago a malapert scholar called attention to the sad lapse in the matter of accent which led to the translation

of *κεῖν* as if it were *κείν* (O. 2, 65),<sup>1</sup> and I was concerned to find that in O. 3 Myers had omitted nearly a whole line (v. 3). So far, I have not found anything to match *κεῖν*-*κείν* in Sir John, though I cannot agree with him in making *βάσσωμεν* intransitive in O. 6, 24, and if Myers has given us a line too little in O. 3, Sir John has given us an *ἄβατον* too much in the text of O. 3, 44. Oddly enough, in that same Third Olympian, which I have chosen as the centre of my projected essay On Translating Pindar, there is a balance of oversights between the rival translators. Myers has made Leto the mother of Kastor and Polydeukes, and Sandys has made Leda the mother of Artemis, and so between them they have mixed up the two mothers of twins. Versed in the technicalities of grammar and the delicacies of synonyms, even the subtleties of the particles do not escape the ken of the new interpreter, so that under his guidance, the careful student may learn to appreciate the lapidary work of Pindar, but for the inevitable criticism in detail there is, as I have just said, no room here, and I pass on to give a brief account of the Introduction.

The Introduction is that of a summarist, and does not produce the effect of a writer who is enamored of his theme, and one recognizes here and there phrases that shew that he was working on material that had been through the hands of others. He seldom ever speaks with full conviction. He leans to the later date of the poet's birth, but he is not clear as to the Doric Aigeid descent of the poet, and inclines to Studniczka's rejection of it. Perhaps Robert's chapter in his *Oidipus* had appeared too late to be incorporated, or to be considered (A. J. P. XXXVI 244). He is evidently as perplexed as he represents Pindar to have been during the Persian War. In the main he follows Schroeder's chronology of the Odes, but there is a formidable array of query marks before 476, when Pindar reached the height of his power. How hazardous the attempt to construct the curve of Pindar's development, I have tried to shew in my Introductory Essay and elsewhere (A. J. P. XXI 471).

As to the style of Pindar, Sir John gives us first Dionysios' characteristic in the *De Compositione Verborum*, as translated by Roberts, then the inevitable passage from Horace, then the Quintilian passage, winding up with the consecrated verses from Gray's *Progress of Poesy*. The antique criticisms require interpretation (A. J. P. XXXV 231), but he does not pause for that, and passes on to his own judgment. We are told that Pindar's style is marked by a constant and

<sup>1</sup> *κεῖν* *παρὰ δῖαιραν*, translated by Myers 'in that new world'. The manifest blunder stands uncorrected in that valuable collection of documents recently published by Professors BOTSFORD and SIHLER (Columbia University Press) and entitled *Hellenic Civilization* (p. 306) —not a fair specimen, it is to be hoped, of the revised translations promised by the editors.

habitual use of metaphor. Nothing is said as to the relation of metaphor to simile—an important point in the contrast between epic and lyric poetry (A. J. P. XXXV 229). After giving a number of examples, he refers the reader to Fennell and Gildersleeve, but for fear of going too far in praise of the poet, he adds in a footnote Schroeder's judgment, who somewhat blasphemously considers Pindar's metaphors 'rude and unrefined'—for so he translates 'roh u. ungeläutert', which I have rendered 'crude and unclarified'—'unrefined' being too much specialized (A. J. P. XXVI 115). Splendor of language is one of the characteristics of Pindar that can't escape any critic; but I am interested to find that Sir John subsumes under this the characteristic I called 'swiftness', for he claims that swiftness adds to splendor. He is evidently thinking of *κορυθαίολος* Ἐκτωρ. Next he notices the dexterous way in which the poet links the athletic with the martial exploits of the heroic past, and I note with amusement the more or less dexterous way in which the editor dodges the question as to the interpretation of the myth. Drachmann and Wilamowitz have gone back to the old incidental, tangential employment of the myth. All attempts to find a close nexus, an inner meaning, have been discarded by those scholars, and what I have said on the subject—quoted with full approval by Butcher—must be counted (to use the language of Wilamowitz) among the clouds that have obscured the interpretation of Pindar, and which, he says, have now—thank God—passed away forever.

As to the wisdom of Pindar, Donaldson, as Sandys reminds us, has pointed out one hundred memorable Pindaric saws, and by way of amusing myself one summer, I constructed a Pindaric calendar, with a more or less apt quotation for each day in the year, but I am afraid that my *Calendarium Pindaricum* (A. J. P. XXXII 480) will never find a publisher. One of our greatest Pindarists accuses Pindar of poverty of thought, and Schwartz falls in with him (A. J. P. XXVI 370; XXVII 483), and at one time I thought of writing a paper to prove that Pindar was a prophecy of Plato, and that all Plato was implicit in Pindar, as one English enthusiast has maintained that Browning's Ring and the Book is implicit in Pindar (A. J. P. XXXII 480).

A brief mention of the importance of the games for giving a national character to Pindar's poems leads to a short account of the National Festivals.

As to the structure of the Odes, Sir John evidently inclines to the Terpendrian nome theory, and the recurrent word, but his acceptance amounts to nothing more than the recognition of the simple fact that as a living organism the ode must have a beginning, middle and end. Of my thesis, accepted by Fennell and exploited by Bury (A. J. P. XII 528), he has nothing to

say either in the Introduction or in the summaries prefixed to the various odes.

Some account is given of the three rhythms, the paeonian, the dactylo-epitrite and the logaoedic, but in the hurly-burly of metrical controversy Sir John Sandys is afraid to take sides, and there are no metrical schemes to guide the possessor of the Greek text. A paragraph is devoted to the Dorian, Aeolian, Lydian modes, with some illustrations of their character as exemplified in the various Odes. The chapter on Dialect deals only with the salient features. There is a brief chapter on the Mss., and sigla are given for the readings of the chief editions. If I had the work to do over again, I should be even more conservative than I have shewn myself to be. These changes backward are characteristic either of advance of age, or advance of knowledge. It is a common experience; and Wilamowitz has recently confessed to a similar change of heart in the matter of Aischylos (A. J. P. XXXVI 354), as is observable in Weil's editions of Euripides.

The text is founded on Donaldson's revision of the second edition of Boeckh . . . further revised in many passages after a careful consideration of the readings, or conjectures, frequently by more recent editors'. As a matter of personal interest, I may be permitted to say, that in the Olympians and Pythians there is, if I may trust a rough count, a coincidence of seventy per cent. There is bibliography—Sir John is famous as a bibliographer—a bibliography that does not waste adjectives. Bergk is credited with a few brilliant restorations, and Mezger's commentary is justly called valuable.

The translation is accompanied by a few explanatory notes, but a translation is itself a commentary in brief; and the thirty years that have elapsed since my edition have brought in so much new material, to which Sir John's edition must be added, that I am constrained, as I have already intimated, to reserve what I have to say for a more elaborate article.

B. L. G.

---

Das Kaisertum. Von DR. LUDWIG HAHN. Das Erbe der Alten, Heft vi. Leipzig 1913. Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Pp. 114. M. 3. 50.

Dr. Hahn's valuable studies *Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten* (1906), and *Zum Sprachenkampf im römischen Reich* (1907) have furnished a foundation of solid and extensive learning for the present work. His frankly expressed admiration for monarchical institutions gives him a